CLINTON IMPEACHMENT/Prior Notice of Video Excerpts to be Presented

SUBJECT: Impeachment trial of William Jefferson Clinton for perjury and obstruction of justice. White House Counsel Ruff motion to require prior notice for each video excerpt to be presented.

ACTION: MOTION REJECTED, 46-54

SYNOPSIS: On December 19, 1998, the House of Representatives impeached (indicted) President Clinton for perjury and obstruction of justice based on his actions and statements in relation to a Federal civil rights sexual harassment lawsuit that was filed against him by a former employee, Paula Corbin Jones. Ms. Jones alleged that in 1991, when she was an Arkansas State employee, then-Arkansas Governor Clinton exposed himself to her in a crude sexual advance which she refused, and that she subsequently and consequently suffered numerous adverse employment actions and was defamed. During the discovery phase of the lawsuit, the presiding judge ordered President Clinton to answer under oath certain questions posed by Ms. Jones' attorneys regarding any history he had of involvement in sexual relationships with State or Federal employees (such lines of questioning in sexual harassment lawsuits are a common means of establishing whether patterns of similar sexual harassment exist, including patterns of reward and punishment based upon the responses of subordinate employees to sexual advances). Those questions, which were posed in January, 1998, included questions regarding his relationship with a former White House intern, Monica Lewinsky (President Clinton had met Ms. Lewinsky and had begun a relationship with her when she was an intern). Later, in August, 1998, Ms. Lewinsky testified before a Federal grand jury, under a grant of immunity, regarding an affidavit she had filed in the Jones case. She gave detailed testimony and provided extensive corroborating physical evidence of a sexual relationship with the President. The President also testified before that grand jury in August. His testimony concerned his relationship with Ms. Lewinsky, his testimony before the Federal court in the sexual harassment lawsuit, and actions he took and statements he made before and after testifying in that lawsuit. The House impeachment of the President for obstruction of justice is based on numerous charges that he illegally tried to conceal the nature of his relationship with Ms. Lewinsky from the Federal court and the grand jury, and its impeachment of him for perjury is based on charges of numerous perjurious statements in his grand jury testimony, including

(See other side)

YEAS (46)				NAYS (54)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans	Democrats (45 or 100%)		Republicans (54 or 98%)		Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans	Democrats (0)	
(1 or 2%)						(0)		
Jeffords	Akaka Baucus Bayh Biden Bingaman Boxer Breaux Bryan Byrd Cleland Conrad Daschle Dodd Dorgan Durbin Edwards Feingold Feinstein Graham Harkin Hollings Inouye Johnson	Kennedy Kerrey Kerry Kohl Landrieu Lautenberg Leahy Levin Lieberman Lincoln Mikulski Moynihan Murray Reed Reid Robb Rockefeller Sarbanes Schumer Torricelli Wellstone Wyden	Abraham Allard Ashcroft Bennett Bond Brownback Bunning Burns Campbell Chafee Cochran Collins Coverdell Craig Crapo DeWine Domenici Enzi Fitzgerald Frist Gorton Gramm Grams Grassley Gregg Hagel Hatch	Helms Hutchinson Hutchison Inhofe Kyl Lott Lugar Mack McCain McConnell Murkowski Nickles Roberts Roth Santorum Sessions Shelby Smith, Bob Smith, Gordon Snowe Specter Stevens Thomas Thompson Thurmond Voinovich Warner		EXPLANAT 1—Official I 2—Necessar 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Annou AN—Annou PY—Paired PN—Paired	ily Absent nced Yea nced Nay Yea	

VOTE NO. 14 FEBRUARY 4, 1999

charges of perjury regarding his relationship with Ms. Lewinsky and his efforts to obstruct justice in the sexual harassment case against him.

The White House Counsel Ruff motion would require the House Managers to provide by 2:00pm, Fe bruary 5, 1999, written notice to the President's counsel of the precise page and line designations of any video excerpts from the depositions of Monica Lewinsky, Vernon Jordan, or Sidney Blumenthal (see vote Nos. 5 and 12) that they planned to use during their 3-hour presentation on Saturday (the Majority Leader had earlier announced that if the Senate agreed to permit the presentation of video excerpts that presentation would be on Saturday, February 6, and would be for 6 hours, equally divided) or during their closing arguments.

Arguments by the House Managers:

The President's lawyers are asking the Senate to make us to disclose ahead of time every bit of evidence that we will present. It is a highly unusual request. We recall the response by one of the late great justices of the California Supreme Court, Otto Kaus, when a similar request was made of him: "I believe the appropriate legal response to your request is that it is none of your damn business what the other side is going to put on."

Arguments by lawyers for the President:

It is normal in a civil trial to designate ahead of time the portions of depositions that are going to be presented in court. In this instance, such prior designation by the House Managers would make the trial fairer because it would give us time to prepare responses. Also, it might make the trial move more quickly, because we might decide not to present some videotaped excerpts if we found out that the House Managers were going to present those same excerpts.